

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LEO VESPI,

Plaintiff,

File No. 1:12-CV-858

v.

HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC
REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On December 14, 2012, United States Magistrate Judge Joseph G. Scoville issued a report and recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that Plaintiff’s motion to remand (Dkt. No. 18) be denied, and that Defendants’ motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 13) be granted. (Dkt. No. 29, R&R.) Plaintiff filed objections to the R&R. (Dkt. No. 32.) Defendants filed a motion for leave to file an untimely response to Plaintiff’s objections. (Dkt. No. 34.)

This Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the R&R to which specific objection has been made, and may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge’s findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). “[A] general objection to a magistrate’s report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not satisfy the requirement that an objection be filed. The objections must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.” *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995).

Plaintiff's objections consist of nothing more than a general objection based on his bald assertions that the R&R "demonstrates an appalling lack of understanding of the issues and legal authority" or an intentional disregard of same, lacks substance, and reveals "obvious prejudice." (Dkt. No. 32, Objs.) Plaintiff has not identified any defects in the Magistrate Judge's application of the fraudulent joinder rule, or in his determination that Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted. The Court is satisfied that the R&R accurately recites the facts and correctly applies the pertinent law. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's objections to the R&R (Dkt. No. 32) are **OVERRULED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the December 14, 2012, R&R (Dkt. No. 29) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to remand (Dkt. No. 18) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 13) is **GRANTED**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motion for leave to file a response to Plaintiff's objections (Dkt. No. 34) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

Date: February 4, 2013

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell
ROBERT HOLMES BELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE